

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application are respectfully requested in light of the amendments above and the comments which follow.

As correctly noted in the Office Action Summary, claims 1-14 were pending with claims 7-13 withdrawn from consideration following a Restriction Requirement. By the present response, claim 6 has been amended. Thus, upon entry of the present response, claims 1-14 (with claims 7-13 withdrawn) remain pending and await further consideration on the merits.

Support for the foregoing amendments can be found, for example, in at least the following locations in the original disclosure: the original claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, on the grounds set forth in page 2 of the Official Action.

By the present response, applicant has amended claim 6 in a manner which addresses the above-noted rejection. Specifically, claim 6 has been amended to recite "a supporting edge." Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,550,756 to Trovinger (hereafter "*Trovinger*") in view of EP 339 317 to Ferag (hereafter "*Ferag*") on the grounds set forth on page 2

of the Official Action. For at least the reasons noted below, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that the *Trovinger* patent issued on April 22, 2003, which is after the February 28, 2002 filing date of this application. The *Trovinger* patent was filed on March 30, 2001 and does not claim the benefit of an earlier filing date. Thus, the *Trovinger* patent qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Use of this reference in any obviousness-based rejection of applicant's present claims is improper, because it is commonly assigned to the assignee of the present application. See 35 U.S.C. §103(c) (stating that subject matter developed by another which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of §102, shall not preclude patentability).

Per MPEP §706.02(I)(2), the *Trovinger* patent can be removed as a reference by an affidavit or statement of common ownership at the time of the invention of the present application. Accordingly, applicant provides the following statement:

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/084,459 and U.S. Patent No. 6,550,756 B2 were, at the time U.S. Patent Application No. 10/084,459 was made, commonly owned by or under an obligation of assignment to the Hewlett-Packard Company.

Since the *Trovinger* patent is no longer available as prior art in an obviousness rejection against the application, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections. Accordingly, all pending claims are considered allowable.

~~Registration No. 32,858~~